



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11/18
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,892	01/19/2005	Johann Engelhardt	5005-1090	8857
7278	7590	11/14/2006	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257				PRITCHETT, JOSHUA L
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/521,892	ENGELHARDT, JOHANN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua L. Pritchett	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the control of the first and second light beams independent of one another as stated in claim 28 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-25, 29, 31 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel (US 2002/0171843) in view of Spanner (US 6,535,290).

Regarding claims 21, 39 and 40, Frankel teaches a first beam splitting device (13b) configured to split a first reference beam from the first light beam (from 11a) and a second reference beam from a second light beam (from 11b; Fig. 1); a second beam splitting device (17a) configured to split a third reference beam from the first light beam and a fourth reference beam from the second light beam (Fig. 1). Frankel suggests tuning the light with an ITU position (paras. 0017-0018) but lacks specific reference to the position detector. Spanner teaches a position detector (10) configured to detect respective positions of the reference beams so as to enable at least one of a respective propagation direction and a respective position of at least one of the first and second light beams to be adjusted as a function of at least one of the detected respective positions of the reference beams (Fig. 1; abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the beam splitting device of

Frankel have a position detector as taught by Spanner for the purpose of insuring alignment of the lasers to help prevent incorrect determination of the wavelength by introducing artificial lag time through misalignment.

Regarding claim 22, Frankel teaches the first and second light beams have different wavelengths (abstract).

Regarding claim 23, Frankel teaches the first beam splitting device includes a first interface and the second beam splitting devices includes a second interface (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Frankel teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the dispersive element. Spanner teaches the use of a grating (2.1; col. 4 line 55), which is a dispersive element. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the beam splitting device of Frankel have a dispersive element of Spanner for the purpose of effectively redirecting the path of the reference beams split off of the light beam to minimize the amount of light lost and thereby maximize the amount of light contacting the position detector.

Regarding claims 29 and 31, Frankel teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the control element. Spanner teaches the use of a control element (9) configured to adjust at least one of the respective propagation direction and the respective position of at least one of the first and second light beams (Fig. 1; col. 6 lines 25-34). Spanner further teaches the control element configured to be driven as a function of at least one of the detected respective positions of the reference beams (col. 6 lines 25-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the beam splitting device of Frankel have a control element of Spanner for the purpose of correcting any misalignment of the laser beams.

Regarding claim 35, Frankel teaches the use of a CCD as a detector (para. 0006).

Regarding claims 36-38, Frankel teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the position detector. Spanner teaches a first detector (10) configured to detect the respective position of each of the reference beams simultaneously (Fig. 1). Spanner further teaches the position detector is configured to be calibrated for different respective detectable positions of the reference beams (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the beam splitting device of Frankel have a position detector as taught by Spanner for the purpose of insuring alignment of the lasers to help prevent incorrect determination of the wavelength by introducing artificial lag time through misalignment.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel (US 2002/0171843) in view of Spanner (US 6,535,290) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Cook (US 3,905,684).

Frankel in combination with Spanner teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the first and second beam splitting devices being part of a same optical component. Cook teaches the use of prisms (which are dispersive elements) combined together to form a single optical component capable of splitting multiple reference beams from a light beam (Fig. 2a). Cook shows separate prisms in Fig. 1a then shows the prism combined into a single optical component in Fig. 2a. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Frankel in combination with Spanner invention form a single optical component for the purpose of avoiding unwanted reflection of light at the interface of the

prisms and air which would reduce the amount of light contacting the detector and reduce the detector signal strength.

Claims 28, 30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel (US 2002/0171843) in view of Spanner (US 6,535,290) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Amon (US 4,746,798).

Frankel teaches the two light beams initially combined through the use of a dichroic mirror (13a) upstream of the first beam splitting device (13b; Fig. 1) but lacks reference to tilting that mirror. Amon teaches the use of tilting a dichroic mirror based on the signal produced by the position of light on a detector (col. 7 lines 10-20). The tilting of the Frankel dichroic mirror (13a) would control only the position of the light coming from laser (11b) by changing the angle which the beam travels through the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Frankel in combination with Spanner invention have the dichroic mirror of Frankel to be tiltable as taught by Amon for the purpose of correcting for any lag time inherently in the system to obtain a more precise result for the unknown wavelength laser.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Aughton (US 4,645,302) teaches the use of prisms to split reference beams at the air/prism interface (Fig. 2).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua L. Pritchett whose telephone number is 571-272-2318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew A. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Joshua L Pritchett
Examiner
Art Unit 2872